

Gravitational rescue of minimal gauge mediation

Abhishek M. Iyer,^{1,2,*} V Suryanarayana Mummidi,^{2,†} and Sudhir K. Vempati^{2,‡}

¹*Department of Theoretical Physics, Tata Institute of Fundamental Research,*

Homi Bhabha Road, Colaba, Mumbai 400 005, India

²*Centre for High Energy Physics, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore 560012, India*

Abstract

Gravity mediated supersymmetry breaking becomes comparable to gauge mediated supersymmetry breaking contributions when messenger masses are close to the GUT scale. By suitably arranging the gravity contributions one can modify the soft supersymmetry breaking sector to generate a large stop mixing parameter and a light Higgs mass of 125 GeV. In this kind of hybrid models, however the nice features of gauge mediation like flavour conservation etc., are lost. To preserve the nice features, gravitational contributions should become important for lighter messenger masses and should be important only for certain fields. This is possible when the hidden sector contains multiple (at least two) spurions with hierarchical vacuum expectation values. In this case, the gravitational contributions can be organised to be ‘just right’. We present a complete model with two spurion hidden sector where the gravitational contribution is from a warped flavour model in a Randall-Sundrum setting. Along the way, we present simple expressions to handle renormalisation group equations when supersymmetry is broken by two different sectors at two different scales.

*Electronic address: abhishek@theory.tifr.res.in

†Electronic address: soori@cts.iisc.ernet.in

‡Electronic address: vempati@cts.iisc.ernet.in

I. INTRODUCTION AND MOTIVATION

The discovery of the Higgs boson with a mass ~ 125 GeV a couple of years ago [1–4] has led to tremendous excitement in the field. While the discovery has validated the Higgs mechanism of the Standard Model and is broadly consistent with expectations based on Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model (MSSM) ¹, minimal models of supersymmetry breaking like gauge mediation have been strongly constrained by this discovery.

Gauge Mediation has several nice features that make it an attractive mechanism for supersymmetry breaking : (i) no additional flavour violation in the soft sector (ii) minimal models have very few parameters, some times as low as one, making them very predictive (iii) different phenomenology compared to the traditional gravity mediated models. However, the discovery of the Higgs boson with mass ~ 125 GeV, has strongly constrained these models. The one loop corrected mass for the lightest CP even Higgs boson has the form [5–10]

$$m_h^2 = M_Z^2 \cos 2\beta^2 + \frac{3m_t^4}{4\pi^2 v^2} \left[\log \left(\frac{M_S^2}{m_t^2} \right) + \frac{X_t^2}{M_S^2} \left(1 - \frac{X_t^2}{12M_S^2} \right) \right], \quad (1)$$

Where $M_S = \sqrt{m_{\tilde{t}_1} m_{\tilde{t}_2}}$ and $X_t = A_t - \mu \cot \beta$. For M_S around 1 TeV, it can be seen that X_t should be close to its maximal value ($\approx \sqrt{6}M_S$) to obtain a Higgs mass around 125 GeV [11–14]. It is well known, in minimal gauge mediation, that tri-linear A terms are highly suppressed at the mediation scale leading to much smaller values of X_t than required at the weak scale. One can of course try to increase the mediation scale to increase the renormalisation group (RG) running from traditional values of ~ 100 TeV all the way up to the GUT scale. However it has been shown that a sufficient appreciation in the X_t value is only possible, for ~ 1 TeV stops, with heavy gluinos and/or tachyonic stops at high scale [15]. Since X_t is very small in GMSB, $M_S \sim 4$ TeV is required to achieve the desired Higgs mass. This scenario is not very attractive as it comes at the expense of making the stop mass eigenvalues out of reach of the LHC. Thus minimal versions of GMSB models would fail to accommodate 125 GeV Higgs, if the SUSY particle masses lie below 2 TeV or so.

Various extensions have been proposed in the literature to make models of gauge mediation compatible with the 125 GeV Higgs mass [16–32]. For instance, one could consider explicit Yukawa like messenger matter mixing in addition to gauge interactions[33–35]. In some cases of this type, it is possible to get solutions with minimal fine tuning leading to a naturally light Higgs boson with

¹ We mean that the observed Higgs is within theoretical upper bound of 135 GeV [5–7].

mass 125 GeV[25, 36, 37]. Another possibility is to consider, anomaly free, U(1) gauge extension of MSSM gauge group[38–46].

Alternatively, one can ask the question whether gravity mediated supersymmetry breaking contribution can help in generating large A_t in GMSB models, while keeping the spectrum within the reach of LHC ($\lesssim 2\text{--}3$ TeV). Note that these gravity contributions are always present in any gauge mediation model as Planck scale suppressed operators. Typically, this contribution is suppressed due to the relatively ‘low’ values of F -terms required by gauge mediation. For example, the stop tri-linear coupling at the reduced Planck scale would be generated as

$$A_t \simeq \frac{\langle F_X \rangle}{M_{Pl}}$$

where $\langle F_X \rangle$, is the vacuum expectation value (vev) of the F-term of the spurion multiplet and $M_{Pl} \sim 10^{18}$ GeV, is the reduced Planck scale. In gauge mediation models, typically $\langle F_X \rangle$ lies in the range $\sim 10^{10} - 10^{12}$ GeV². This F_X value is too small to have any meaningful impact on the soft sector when contributions from gravity mediation also are included along with GMSB contributions; they are of the order $\sim (10^{-8} - 10^{-6})$ GeV. As will be discussed in the next section, if one increases the mass of the messengers the gravitational contribution become increasingly important. This result holds true as long as supersymmetry breaking by a single spurion parametrises the hidden sector.

In this paper, we consider the case where the hidden sector is parametrised by more than one spurion fields and show that the gravity contribution to the A-terms could be much larger as one can effectively ‘decouple’ both the gravity and gauge contributions. In such case, even if the messenger masses are smaller, gravity mediation can play an important role. Models with multiple spurion fields are quite common, for example in string based models [47–56], mirage mediation [57–64] and models with multiple hidden sectors [48, 49, 64–66]. In the recent times, supersymmetry breaking in multiple sectors has been receiving attention in literature. Most of the works are concentrated on Goldstini sector and their corresponding collider phenomenology [67–70].

The combination of gauge and gravity mediations, some times called “hybrid models” of supersymmetry breaking [71, 72] has been studied in the literature with focus on specific issues in phenomenology like flavour or dark matter. In the present work, we show that this idea can be used to address the light CP even Higgs mass problem in minimal gauge mediation. However, it should be noted that the framework presented here is quite different compared to the ones in the literature. In the present work, we focus on the Higgs sector, especially concentrate on how to increase its mass through additional gravity mediation contributions to the minimal messenger

model. It turns out that the spurions should have hierarchical F -terms, and furthermore the gravity contributions should be ‘flavoured’ in the sense that the A terms of the third generation should be larger compared to the first two generations. Similarly the soft terms should be such that the total spectrum should still be dominated minimal gauge mediation.

The paper is organized as follows. In the next section, we discuss the character of the gravitational contributions required to generate large A -terms in minimal messenger model. We analyze the gravity contributions in GMSB models in both the cases with one and two spurions in the hidden sector. We also study this scenario using semi-analytical expressions for RGs. In section 3, we present an explicit model for gravity sector which has the essential features and also present explicit numerical examples. We close with a summary.

II. CHARACTER OF GRAVITATIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS

In minimal gauge mediation, soft terms are generated through 1-loop and 2-loop diagrams involving messenger fields coupled to the MSSM fields through gauge interactions. The messengers are connected through the hidden sector which is parametrised by a spurion field X as

$$W_{\text{mess}} = \lambda X \Phi \bar{\Phi} \quad (2)$$

where $\Phi, \bar{\Phi}$ are messenger fields and $X = M_X + \theta^2 F_X$ parametrises the hidden sector. M_X is the mass of the messenger fields and F_X is the supersymmetry breaking F -term. The soft terms due to gauge mediation at the messenger scale M_X are given by [73–76]:

$$\begin{aligned} M'_a &\approx \frac{\alpha_a}{4\pi} \left(\frac{F_X}{M_X} \right) \\ m'^2 &\approx 2 \sum_{a=1}^3 \left(\frac{\alpha_a}{4\pi} \right)^2 C_a \left(\frac{F_X^2}{M_X^2} \right) \\ A' &\approx 0 \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Typically $\Lambda \equiv F_X/M_X$ is chosen to be around 100 TeV to get low energy soft terms of $\mathcal{O}(1)$ TeV. Generally M_X is chosen to be close to Λ (twice of Λ is the usual choice) and it can be as large as the GUT scale. F_X is scaled accordingly while keeping Λ fixed. The low energy spectrum is computed by running of the renormalisation group equations (RGE) from M_X to the weak scale. Since we are concerned mostly with the light CP even Higgs mass, we will concentrate on the parameters relevant for it. At the weak scale, the relevant parameters appearing in eq.(3) can be

written as

$$\begin{aligned}
m_{Q_3}^2(M_{weak}) &\approx 1 \times 10^{-4} \Lambda^2 \text{ GeV}^2 \\
m_{U_3}^2(M_{weak}) &\approx 7.62 \times 10^{-5} \Lambda^2 \text{ GeV}^2 \\
A_t(M_{weak}) &\approx -0.002 \Lambda \text{ GeV}
\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where $\Lambda = \frac{\langle F_X \rangle}{M_X}$. The expressions are evaluated for $M_X = 10^6$. Keeping Λ fixed, if M_X is increased from 10^6 to 10^{14} , then the magnitude of A_t only increases from 0.002Λ to 0.005Λ . Increasing Λ will also increase M_S , the SUSY scale, thus spoiling naturalness. It can be shown that even by choosing a large M_X close to the GUT scale, so as to increase the logarithmic running, the Higgs mass barely manages to go beyond the LEP limit of 114.2 GeV from eq.(1). This is because X_t remains small, as long as M_S is fixed to be 1 TeV. This result is now well known [15].

Gravity mediation will always contribute to the soft terms at the high scale. However, for the full range of $F_X \sim 10^{12} - 10^{21} \text{ GeV}^2$ (fixing $\Lambda = 100 \text{ TeV}$). Gravitational contributions are only significant when the messenger scale reaches the Planck scale. The gravity contributions at the Planck scale are given in terms of effective operators as

$$\begin{aligned}
m_{ij}^2 &= \kappa_{ij} \int d^2\theta d^2\bar{\theta} \left(\frac{X^\dagger X}{M_{Pl}^2} \right) \Phi^\dagger \Phi \\
M_{ab} &= f_{ab} \int d^2\theta \left(\frac{X}{M_{Pl}} \right) \mathcal{W}^a \mathcal{W}^b \\
A_{ijk} &= \eta_{ijk} \int d^2\theta \left(\frac{X}{M_{Pl}} \right) \Phi_i \Phi_j \Phi_k
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where κ_{ij} and η_{ijk} are arbitrary $\mathcal{O}(1)$ parameters and f_{ab} is the gauge kinetic function. At the messenger scale M_X , if the running is not significantly large from M_{Pl} to M_X , the soft terms including both gauge and gravity contributions can be parametrised as

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{m}_{ij}^2(M_X) &\approx m_{3/2}^2 \left[\frac{\alpha_a^2}{(4\pi)^2} C_a \frac{M_{Pl}^2}{M_X^2} \delta_{ij} + \tilde{\kappa}_{ij} + \beta_{ij} \right] \\
\tilde{M}_{ab}(M_X) &\approx m_{3/2} \left[\frac{\alpha_a}{(4\pi)} \frac{M_{Pl}}{M_X} + \gamma_a \right] \delta_{ab} \\
\tilde{A}_{ijk}(M_X) &\approx m_{3/2} [\tilde{\eta}_{ijk} + \xi_{ijk}]
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where we have used $\langle F_X \rangle = m_{3/2} M_{Pl}$ and $\tilde{\kappa}$ and $\tilde{\eta}$ are the renormalisation group corrected κ and η couplings respectively and are also of $\mathcal{O}(1)^2$. β , ξ and γ are corrections to the original couplings due

² Where $\tilde{\kappa} \approx \kappa$ and $\tilde{\eta} \approx \eta$.

to RG running. These parameters contain the Clebsch factors (which could be large in the presence of GUT group between M_{Pl} and M_X) and the logarithmic factors due to running. Numerically $\beta = \xi \approx \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \text{Log} \left(\frac{M_{Pl}}{10^{16}} \right) \sim 0.02$. At one loop, the coefficients γ can be determined exactly and are given as $\gamma_1 = 0.96$, $\gamma_2 = 0.99$, $\gamma_3 = 1.01$. We note here that the gravitino mass in this case ($m_{3/2} \sim 100$ GeV) is large as compared to low scale GMSB, where typically $\langle F_X \rangle \ll M_{Pl}^2$. This is because, keeping $\Lambda = 10^5$ GeV fixed, a choice of a heavy messenger scale $M_X \sim 10^{16}$ GeV also pushes the vacuum expectation value of the spurion to $\langle F_X \rangle \sim 10^{21}$ GeV². This framework is similar to the one presented in Ref. [71, 77]. There it has been shown that an explicit realization requires certain conditions on the messenger sector.

From the above effective parametrisation, it is clear that for heavy messengers with mass $\sim M_{Pl}$ scale, the gravitational mediation contributions can become comparable and can significantly alter the spectrum. In the effective picture represented by Eq.(6), we can choose the gravity coefficients such that soft terms to have the required form to give the correct Higgs mass at the weak scale. For example, using the analysis of [15], we can choose the gravity contributions to the stop sector and gluino sector such that they generate a large enough A_t at the weak scale after RG running.

From the above discussion, one can conclude that gravitational contributions can indeed rescue minimal gauge mediation if the messenger masses are sufficiently high and they are of the right type. The question then arises what happens if the messenger masses are not so heavy and are only of the order of 100 TeV or so; Can gravitational contributions still play a role? This is the question we try to address now.

The advantage of such a ‘low’ scale for M_X is that the nice features of gauge mediation are left intact. However, gravitational mediation contributions to the soft sector are small as discussed above. One simple way to increase the gravitational mediation would be to consider two different sectors of supersymmetry breaking. While only one of them couples to the messengers, both couple to gravity. In this set up, let us try to understand the character of the gravitational contributions.

We will consider two spurions X_1 and X_2 parametrisising the two sectors where supersymmetry is broken. As before we denote $X_1 \equiv M_{X_1} + \theta^2 F_1$, which couples to the messengers at the scale $M_{X_1} \sim 100$ TeV. The other spurion X_2 which parametrises the sector which does not couple to messengers³. In terms of the effective operators, just below M_{Pl} scale, the following are the contributions from the gravitational mediation:

³ In the limit both these sectors are sequestered, we will have a new particle in the spectrum, the Goldstino, which we will not consider here [67–70].

$$\begin{aligned}
m_{ij}^2 &= \int d^2\theta d^2\bar{\theta} \left(k_{ij} \frac{X_1^\dagger X_1}{M_{Pl}^2} + k'_{ij} \frac{X_2^\dagger X_2}{M_{Pl}^2} \right) \Phi^\dagger \Phi \\
M_{ab} &= f_{ab} \int d^2\theta \left(\frac{X_1}{M_{Pl}} + \frac{X_2}{M_{Pl}} \right) \mathcal{W}^a \mathcal{W}^b \\
A_{ijk} &= \int d^2\theta \left(\eta_{ijk} \frac{X_1}{M_{Pl}} + \eta'_{ijk} \frac{X_2}{M_{Pl}} \right) \Phi_i \Phi_j \Phi_k
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where $F_1 \ll F_2$. At the scale M_{X_1} additional contributions from gauge mediation have the same form as in Eq.(3) with F replaced by F_1 . To obtain the weak scale spectrum, we use semi-analytical expressions given in Appendix A. We observed that in this case, there is a nice way of organising the weak scale soft terms which are a result of the RGE evolution from M_{Pl} to M_{X_1} and then to M_{weak} . Through out this paper, we will use primed objects to denote the contributions from gauge mediation sector. Unprimed objects will denote those from gravity mediation. The total soft terms have a $\sim$ on them. At the weak scale, we have the following relations:

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{M}_a(weak) &= M_a(weak) + M'_a(weak) \\
\tilde{A}(weak) &= A(weak) + A'(weak)
\end{aligned}$$

Thus both the gaugino masses and the tri-linear terms just add up at the weak scale as though they have no knowledge about the presence of another supersymmetry breaking sector⁴.

The scalar masses however, as they depend quadratically on the gaugino masses do not add linearly. They have mixed contributions from both the supersymmetry breaking sectors. Schematically they can be written as (neglecting the Yukawa contributions)

$$\tilde{m}_{\tilde{f}}^2(weak) = m_{\tilde{f}}'^2(weak) + m_{\tilde{f}}^2(weak) + \sum_a M_a M'_a \zeta_a \zeta'_a \tag{8}$$

$\zeta(\zeta')$ are the RG factors from $M_{X_2} = M_{Pl}$ to weak scale and M_{X_1} to weak scale respectively (for more details, see the Appendix A).

The total solution can be schematically represented by the following two figures: Fig. (1) represents the total solutions for the gaugino masses M_i and the tri-linears where as Fig. (2) represents the sfermion mass squared terms. The total gaugino masses and the A terms, at the weak scale, are just the linear sums of the weak scale solutions of the two independent sectors which is described in Fig. (1). The scalar mass terms at the weak scale, however, contain cross terms mixing

⁴ These results are true only up to one loop order. Issues about higher loops and multiple (greater than 2) SUSY breaking sectors will be considered elsewhere.

contributions from both of the sectors which is described in Fig. (2). The solution of the RGE




FIG. 1: RGE running of gauginos and A terms in hybrid SUSY breaking




FIG. 2: RGE running of scalar squared masses in hybrid SUSY breaking

presented here can be generalised easily for any scenario where supersymmetry is broken at two different scales and preserves the MSSM structure. Similarly it can be generalised to more than two sectors of supersymmetry breaking at different scales.

In Table [I], we give a numerical example of low energy spectrum due to supersymmetry breaking derived from two different hidden sectors *i.e.* gravity and gauge mediation. The first two rows are the low scale values of the soft masses from SUSY breaking due to gravity and gauge mediation respectively. The third row gives the low scale values when SUSY breaking due to both gravity and gauge mediation are present at two different scales. As expected, we find that the A terms and the gaugino masses, at the weak scale, to be the linear sum of the gauge and gravity contributions individually⁵. The soft masses on the other hand do not add up linearly. For illustration, we present

⁵ The slight discrepancy in the A terms due to individual sum of the two contributions and that due to hybrid SUSY

the results for third generation squarks. The pure interference terms are listed in the fourth row. The interference terms could become important when the contributions to the soft terms due one of the sectors of SUSY breaking is sub-dominant.

	$m_{\tilde{Q}_3}^2$ [GeV ²]	$m_{\tilde{U}_3}^2$ [GeV ²]	$m_{\tilde{D}_3}^2$ [GeV ²]	A_t [GeV]	M_1 [GeV]	M_2 [GeV]	M_3 [GeV]
Gravity mediation	3.2×10^6	2.1×10^6	3.5×10^6	-2091	456.5	846.9	2191.8
Gauge mediation	1.04×10^6	0.84×10^6	1.01×10^6	-280	139.0	263.7	722.94
Hybrid susy breaking	4.67×10^6	3.43×10^6	5.04×10^6	-2283.4	603.12	1110.09	2817.3
Interference terms	0.43×10^6	0.49×10^6	0.53×10^6	~ 0	~ 0	~ 0	~ 0

TABLE I: To illustrate the organizing principle discussed in the text, scalar squared masses, tri-linear coupling A_t and gauginos are presented for different mediation schemes. Rest of the parameters are fixed as $\tan \beta=10$ for all the schemes, For gravity mediation: $m_0=500$ GeV, $M_{\frac{1}{2}}=1000$ GeV, $A_0=-1000$ GeV, For gauge mediation: $\Lambda = 10^5$ GeV and $M_{X_1}=10^6$ GeV

Returning to the problem at hand, we demand that the gravitational contributions in this case should be “just right” to generate the right Higgs mass. This would mean that gravity should contribute significantly to A (mainly A_t) terms but not to anything else. Practically such a situation is hard to achieve unless one assumes a flavoured supersymmetry breaking in the gravity sector. Such examples are abound in literature either based on U(1) symmetries [78, 79] or extra dimensions [80]. In the following, we present an example based on Randall-Sundrum Models [81].

Before concluding this section, an important comment is in order. For the gravitational contributions to be of the same order as the gauge mediated contributions, the condition can be summarised as $F_{X_1}/F_{X_2} \sim M_{X_1}/M_{X_2}$ ⁶. A hidden sector model which allows for such hierarchical F-term vacuum expectation values (vevs) would be needed to provide such a solution. In the present work, we do not construct explicit hidden sector models with such properties, but however, assume existence of such models.

breaking which can be attributed to the difference between numerical and analytic computations. It is independent of the boundary parameters.

⁶ More accurately it is represented as $\tilde{\alpha} F_{X_1}/M_{X_1} \sim y F_{X_2}/M_{X_2}$. Where $\tilde{\alpha}$ is gauge coupling in GMSB where as y is the appropriate Yukawa coupling in gravity mediation mechanism.

III. A COMPLETE EXAMPLE WITH RANDALL SUNDRUM AT HIGH SCALE

The Randall-Sundrum (RS) setup consists of a single extra-dimension of radius R compactified on a S_1/Z_2 orbifold. Two branes, IR and UV are located at the $y = \pi R$ and $y = 0$ orbifold fixed points respectively. This model was originally proposed as solution to the hierarchy problem by means of a geometric warp factor defined as

$$\epsilon = e^{-kR\pi} \sim 10^{-16} \quad (9)$$

where k is the reduced Planck scale and $kR \sim 11$. The extent of warping is set by the radius R of the extra-dimension. UV sensitivity of the Higgs mass is ‘warped’ down to the weak scale by the relation $M_{IR} = M_{ew} \sim e^{-kR\pi} M_{Pl}$.

Here we consider a modification of the RS setup with a similar background geometry but with a radius $R' \sim R/8$. As a result the IR scale corresponds to the GUT scale, M_{GUT} . Such frameworks have been considered [82–87]. The spectrum of the effective 4D theory below the GUT scale is that of MSSM.

We assume the two Higgs doublet H_u and H_d to be localized on the low energy brane (IR brane). Matter and gauge fields are in the bulk. Supersymmetry breaking spurion $X_2 = \theta^2 F_{X_2}$ is introduced on the IR brane. SUSY breaking terms are generated by the brane local interactions of the spurion with the bulk fields. The F term (F_{X_2}) of the spurion X_2 develops a vacuum expectation value and generates the soft masses. In the canonical basis, the soft breaking terms are of the form [82–85]:

$$\begin{aligned} m_{H_u, H_d}^2 &= \hat{\beta}_{u,d} m_{3/2}^2 \\ (m_{\tilde{f}}^2)_{ij} &= m_{3/2}^2 \hat{\beta}_{ij} e^{(1-c_i-c_j)kR\pi} \xi(c_i) \xi(c_j) \\ A_{ij}^{u,d} &= m_{3/2} A'_{ij} e^{(1-c_i-c_j)kR\pi} \xi(c_i) \xi(c_j) \\ m_{1/2} &= k_h m_{3/2} \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where the gravitino mass is defined as

$$m_{3/2}^2 = \frac{\langle F_{eff} \rangle^2}{k^2} = \frac{\langle F_{eff} \rangle^2}{M_{Pl}^2} \quad (11)$$

where $F_{eff}^2 = F_{X_2}^2 + F_{X_1}^2$, $\hat{\beta}_{ij}, A', k_h$ are dimensionless $\mathcal{O}(1)$ parameters. $\xi(c_i)$ is defined as

$$\xi(c_i) = \sqrt{\frac{0.5 - c_i}{e^{(1-2c_i)\pi kR} - 1}}, \quad (12)$$

Hadron				Lepton			
parameter	Value	parameter	Value	parameter	Value	parameter	Value
c_{Q_1}	1.49	c_{D_1}	1.52	c_{L_1}	1.59	c_{E_1}	1.32
c_{Q_2}	1.09	c_{D_2}	1.68	c_{L_2}	1.18	c_{E_2}	1.15
c_{Q_3}	-1.59	c_{D_3}	1.28	c_{L_3}	1.37	c_{E_3}	-.22
c_{U_1}	2.0	c_{U_2}	1.89	-	-	-	-
c_{U_3}	0	-	-	-	-	-	-

TABLE II: Example point of the bulk mass parameters which satisfy both fermion mass fits.

From eq.(3), it is clear that the soft masses follow the structure of the fermion masses which are determined by

$$(m_F)_{ij} = v \hat{y}_{ij} e^{(1-c_i-c_j)kR\pi} \xi(c_i) \xi(c_j) \quad (13)$$

where v is the vacuum expectation value and $\hat{y}_{ij}$ are $\mathcal{O}(1)$ Yukawa couplings. The resulting spectrum is flavorful in the super CKM basis. In particular, the stop sector along with A_t is enhanced naturally as it follows the top mass. The other sectors(12 and 23) however, are highly suppressed as they follow the CKM matrix.

We now provide a numerical example of this case where we use a set of c parameters to determine the boundary conditions for the soft masses at M_{GUT} . The results of the analysis of [87] are used where the technique of χ^2 minimization was used to determine the c parameters. A particular choice of c parameters which we use for our analysis is given in Table [II].

We use a slightly modified version of SUSEFLAV [88] to determine the low energy spectrum. The boundary conditions for the sfermion masses due gravity mediation are obtained by using the points in Table II in Eq.(3). Fig 3 gives the GUT scale contributions to the soft masses as a function of c parameters. Since the lighter generations are located away from the IR brane where the Higgs fields and SUSY breaking, their corresponding GUT scale contributions would be very tiny.

While there is sufficient choice and freedom among the $\mathcal{O}(1)$ parameters from $1/10$ to 10 , below we describe one particular example. The gravitino mass is chosen to be $m_{3/2} = \frac{\langle F_2 \rangle}{M_{X_2}} = 1000$ GeV. In the slepton mass matrix, the $\mathcal{O}(1)$ parameters in Eq. 3 is chosen to be $\hat{\beta}_{ij} \sim 0.3$. For the squark mass matrix we choose $\hat{\beta}_{ij} = 1$. As the Higgs doublets and the SUSY breaking spurion are localized on the same brane, fitting smaller masses for the fermions would also result in the corresponding




FIG. 3: GUT scale contribution to the soft mass parameters as a function of c parameters.

slepton masses to the small. As a result the soft masses for the lighter generations are nearly zero at the Planck scale. As a result of this the right handed sleptons will have a tendency to be the lightest supersymmetric particle (LSP) as can be seen from the following term in its one loop beta-function

$$S = \tilde{m}_{H_u}^2 - \tilde{m}_{H_d}^2 + Tr(\tilde{m}_Q^2 - 2\tilde{m}_U^2 - m_L^2 + \tilde{m}_D^2 + \tilde{m}_E^2) \quad (14)$$

As the slepton masses are nearly zero for all three generations the above term is dominated by the contribution due to third generation squarks. If S is positive, the contributions due to M_1 and S go in opposite directions which has a tendency to decrease the slepton mass further. S can be made negative by choosing the Higgsino mass to be non-universal at the high scale. Increasing $\hat{M}_1$ is not useful as it also increases the mass of the lightest neutralino thereby still retaining the right handed slepton as the LSP. S can be made negative by choosing the Higgsinos to be non-universal, in particular $\tilde{m}_{H_u}^2 < \tilde{m}_{H_d}^2$. In particular we choose

$$\tilde{m}_{H_u}^2 = 500 \text{ GeV}^2 \quad \tilde{m}_{H_d}^2 = 1000 \text{ GeV}^2 \quad (15)$$

For the electroweakinos, $M_{1,2} = 50 \text{ GeV}$ is chosen to lower the contribution to the sleptons. This corresponds to a choice of $k_h = 0.07$ in Eq.(3) while we chose $M_3 = 500 \text{ GeV}$ for the super-partner mass of the $SU(3)$ gauge field. On account of the small masses of the gauginos the sfermions do not run significantly and the gauge mediation effects will have a tendency to dominate.

For the trilinear couplings we choose $A'_{ij} = Y'_{ij}$ except for $i = j = 3$ where Y'_{ij} is the $\mathcal{O}(1)$ Yukawa coupling which fits the fermion masses. The tri-linear coupling for the top, A_{33}^u , is expected to be naturally large compared to those corresponding to the lighter generations. This can be attributed to the fact that the structure of the tri-linear coupling in this model is exactly similar to the

corresponding mass matrices as shown in Eq. 3. Thus the c parameters which fit a large top mass, will also generate a corresponding larger tri-linear coupling for the top. The couplings can be further enhanced by choosing the $\mathcal{O}(1)$ parameter $A'_{33} = -2.5 Y'_{33}$. The boundary conditions for gauge mediation are obtained at $M_{X_1} = 10^6$ by choosing $\Lambda = 2.293 \times 10^5$.

Table[III] gives the spectrum for the squarks at M_S in a scenario where two sources of supersymmetry breaking is implemented in a high scale RS model.

$\times 10^6$	$m_{\tilde{Q}_1}^2$	$m_{\tilde{Q}_2}^2$	$m_{\tilde{Q}_3}^2$	$m_{\tilde{U}_1}^2$	$m_{\tilde{U}_2}^2$	$m_{\tilde{U}_3}^2$	$m_{\tilde{D}_1}^2$	$m_{\tilde{D}_2}^2$	$m_{\tilde{D}_3}^2$	$m_{\tilde{L}_1}^2$	$m_{\tilde{L}_2}^2$	$m_{\tilde{L}_3}^2$	$m_{\tilde{E}_1}^2$	$m_{\tilde{E}_2}^2$	$m_{\tilde{E}_3}^2$
Gravity mediation	1.20	1.20	1.90	1.27	1.27	-1.33	1.20	1.20	1.18	0.03	0.03	0.03	-0.05	0.05	0.005
Gauge mediation	5.45	5.45	5.04	4.91	4.91	4.12	4.86	4.86	4.84	0.65	0.65	0.65	0.16	0.16	0.16
Hybrid susy breaking	7.1	7.1	7.23	6.5	6.5	2.7	6.5	6.5	6.94	0.68	0.68	0.68	0.105	0.105	0.16

TABLE III: Comparison of contributions to the low energy spectrum for the sfermions due to gravity and gauge mediation incorporated in a high energy RS model for $\tan\beta = 10$. All numbers are in units 10^6 GeV^2

	M_1	M_2	M_3	A_t
Gravity mediation	17.74	32.12	1276.21	-1960.1
Gauge mediation	303.6	564.26	1459.8	-505.65
Hybrid susy breaking	339.80	624.80	2568.9	-3075.3

TABLE IV: Comparison of contributions to the low energy spectrum for the gauginos and A_t due to gravity and gauge mediation incorporated in a high energy RS model for $\tan\beta = 10$. All numbers are in GeV

We find that in the absence of contribution to the soft masses at the messenger scale due to gauge mediation, this choice of boundary conditions at the GUT scale leads to a tachyonic spectrum at M_S . However once the contributions due to gauge mediation are on, we get an acceptable low energy spectrum as shown in Table [V].

Table V gives the complete low energy spectrum at M_S in the presence of both the sources of SUSY breaking. We see that it is possible to accommodate a heavy Higgs mass of $\sim 125 \text{ GeV}$ in a low scale gauge mediation scenario with fairly light stop masses. The rest of the spectrum including the gluinos are reasonably heavy owing to contribution to M_3 from the gravity sector as well as the gauge sector. The dominant contributions are due GMSB as shown in Table IV. Thus

the role played by flavourful gravity mediation is to only generate large trilinear coupling at the gauge messenger scale

Parameter	Mass(TeV)	Parameter	Mass(TeV)	Parameter	Mass(TeV)	Parameter	Mass
$\tilde{t}_1$	1.79	$\tilde{b}_1$	2.62	$\tilde{\tau}_1$	0.46	$\tilde{\nu}_\tau$	0.81
$\tilde{t}_2$	2.74	$\tilde{b}_2$	2.72	$\tilde{\tau}_2$	0.82	$\tilde{\nu}_\mu$	0.81
$\tilde{c}_R$	2.61	$\tilde{s}_R$	2.63	$\tilde{\mu}_R$	0.33	$\tilde{\nu}_e$	0.81
$\tilde{c}_L$	2.74	$\tilde{s}_L$	2.74	$\tilde{\mu}_L$	0.82	-	-
$\tilde{u}_R$	2.61	$\tilde{d}_R$	2.63	$\tilde{e}_R$	0.33	C_1	0.61
$\tilde{u}_L$	2.74	$\tilde{d}_L$	2.74	$\tilde{e}_L$	0.82	C_2	2.01
m_{A^0}	2.69	$m_H^\pm$	2.69	m_h	0.1223	m_H	2.69
N_1	0.33	N_2	0.63	N_3	2.35	N_4	2.35

TABLE V: Soft spectrum at $M_S = 2.15$ TeV due to both gravity and gauge mediation contributions. The messenger scale for gauge mediation is chosen to be $M_{X_1} = 10^6$. The gluino mass is $m_{\tilde{g}} = 2.6$ TeV and we choose $\tan\beta = 10$.

The origin of flavourful soft masses at the GUT scale could potentially lead to large flavour violation at the low scale ⁷. The most stringent constraints are due to transitions between the first two generations in both the leptonic and the hadronic sector. As mentioned earlier, since the lighter generations are localized away from source of SUSY breaking spurion X (and the Higgs) the off-diagonal elements as well the diagonal elements are very small at the GUT scale. Consider the flavour violating parameter δ^f defined as

$$\delta_{ij}^f(i \neq j) = \frac{(U^\dagger \tilde{m}_f^2 U)_{ij}}{\tilde{m}_{susy}^2}(i \neq j) \quad (16)$$

U is rotation matrix which rotates from flavour basis to the mass basis and $\tilde{m}_{susy}^2$ is the geometric mean of diagonal elements $\tilde{m}_{ii}^2$ and $\tilde{m}_{jj}^2$, $i \neq j$. At M_{GUT} , the off diagonal elements for the sfermion mass matrices are simply expressed as

$$(\tilde{m}_f^2)_{ij} = \tilde{m}_{ii}\tilde{m}_{jj} \quad (17)$$

⁷ Since the lowest KK masses are $\mathcal{O}(M_{GUT})$ they do not contribute to the flavour processes.

where $\tilde{m}_{jj} = \sqrt{\tilde{m}_{jj}^2}$. This follows from the construction in Eq.3 and holds when the $\mathcal{O}(1)$ parameter $\hat{\beta}_{ij} = 1$ for all elements of the soft mass matrices. As a result $\delta_{LL,RR} \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$ at M_{GUT} . The tri-linear couplings on the other hand are aligned with fermion mass matrices when $A'_{ij} = Y'_{ij}$. Thus in the SUPER-CKM basis one can expect the tri-linear couplings corresponding to the down sector fermions, $A^{d,E}$, to be nearly proportional to identity. On the other hand A^u will have a hierarchical structure like V_{CKM} . As a result the dominant contributions due to FCNC will be due to the sfermion soft mass matrices.

The diagonal elements however, receive significant contributions due to RGE effects and hence are large at m_{susy} . Additionally unlike the off diagonal elements, the diagonal elements also receive contributions due to gauge mediation at the messenger threshold. The off-diagonal elements on the other hand do not evolve much and are small even at m_{susy} . Thus, while there could be large flavour violation at M_{GUT} , δ_{ij}^f reduces from $\mathcal{O}(1)$ values at the high scale to values consistent with the experimental bounds at the low scale. Table VI gives the high scale δ_{ij} for both the squark and the slepton sector while Table VII gives the corresponding low scale values. We find that while there is potentially large flavour violation at the high scale, the significant running of the diagonal elements push the δ to be consistent with the constraints given in Table VIII. As a result the attractive features of minimal gauge mediation are not compromised. These values are consistent with the upper bounds on the δ_{ij} given below [87]

TABLE VI: High scale (M_{GUT}) δ 's for squark and slepton sector corresponding to the spectrum in Eq.(V)

(i,j)	$ \delta_{LL}^Q $	$ \delta_{LL}^L $	$ \delta_{LR}^D $	$ \delta_{LR}^U $	$ \delta_{RL}^D $	$ \delta_{RL}^U $	$ \delta_{RR}^D $	$ \delta_{RR}^E $	$ \delta_{RR}^U $
12	1	1	10^{-15}	10^{-10}	10^{-16}	10^{-8}	0.69	1	0.03
13	1	1	10^{-11}	10^{-9}	10^{-13}	10^{-7}	1	1	1
23	1	1	10^{-8}	10^{-2}	10^{-9}	0.04	0.69	1	0.03

TABLE VII: Weak scale δ 's for squark and slepton sector corresponding to the spectrum in Eq.(V)

(i,j)	$ \delta_{LL}^Q $	$ \delta_{LL}^L $	$ \delta_{LR}^D $	$ \delta_{LR}^U $	$ \delta_{RL}^D $	$ \delta_{RL}^U $	$ \delta_{RR}^D $	$ \delta_{RR}^E $	$ \delta_{RR}^U $
12	10^{-4}	10^{-5}	10^{-16}	10^{-13}	10^{-14}	10^{-9}	10^{-6}	10^{-3}	10^{-8}
13	0.005	10^{-5}	10^{-15}	10^{-10}	10^{-10}	10^{-6}	10^{-5}	10^{-2}	10^{-4}
23	0.006	10^{-4}	10^{-11}	10^{-9}	10^{-9}	10^{-6}	10^{-7}	10^{-2}	10^{-5}

TABLE VIII: Upper bounds on the flavour violating parameter δ^{down} obtained for $\tilde{m}_q = 2.1$ TeV and $\tilde{m}_l = 0.7$ TeV

(i,j)	$ \delta_{LL}^Q $	$ \delta_{LL}^L $	$ \delta_{LR}^D $	$ \delta_{LR}^E $	$ \delta_{RL}^D $	$ \delta_{RL}^E $	$ \delta_{RR}^D $	$ \delta_{RR}^E $
12	0.053	0.0002	0.0003	3.8×10^{-6}	0.0003	3.8×10^{-6}	0.03	0.03
13	0.34	0.14	0.06	0.03	0.06	0.03	0.26	-
23	0.61	0.16	0.01	0.04	0.02	0.04	0.84	-

To conclude this section, we point out that it is also possible to generate flavourful soft terms in 4D models. One example in 4D is to consider Froggatt-Nielsen (FN) type of models which have an additional horizontal family symmetry $U(1)_X$ [89]. They were introduced to explain the observed hierarchy in the fermion mass and the mixing angles by assigning different charges to different generations of fermion multiplets under $U(1)_X$. Requiring the Kahler potential be canonical, rendered a non-trivial flavour structure to the soft mass sector. One drawback of these models is that $U(1)_X$ group is anomalous and they are only cancelled by the Green-Schwarz anomaly cancellation mechanism [90]. This severely restricts the parameter space of the FN charges of the multiplets which satisfy the fermion mass fits as well as the anomaly cancellation requirement. Further these solutions are also constrained by FCNC processes. The Randall-Sundrum framework is a more generalised setup which is equivalent to the setup of $U(1)_{FN}$ but not as constraining unless unification conditions are imposed [85]

IV. CONCLUSIONS

Gravitational contributions to supersymmetry breaking are typically suppressed in cases where gauge mediated supersymmetry breaking contributions are dominant. In the present work, we show that this is not the case if the supersymmetry breaking happens in multiple sectors which are parametrised in terms of different spurion fields. If they are hierarchical, one can have a situation where gravity contributions can play a supporting role to the gauge mediated contributions and help in generating the right Higgs mass. Of course, this would require that the gravitational contribution should be flavourful which we have achieved by using a Randall Sundrum set up. In the course of this work, we have presented simple “rules of thumb” to RGE equations when supersymmetry is broken by multiple sectors at multiple scales.

Appendix A: Analytic expressions for soft masses in models with two sectors of SUSY breaking

In this section we give the analytic expressions for the soft masses at the weak scale due to SUSY breaking from two different hidden sectors. To begin with, consider the gauginos and the A terms. The net contribution at any scale due to the presence of both gauge and gravity sectors is just the linear sum of individual contributions due to pure gauge and pure gravity mediation. We define the following useful functions:

$$\begin{aligned} z_i(t) &= \frac{1}{(1 + b_i \tilde{\alpha}_i(0) t)} & z'_i(t) &= \frac{1}{(1 + b_i \tilde{\alpha}_i(t_g) t)} \\ k_i(t) &= \frac{1}{2b_i}(1 - z_i(t)^2) & k'_i(t) &= \frac{1}{2b_i}(1 - z'_i(t)^2) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A1})$$

where

$$t_g = 2 \text{Log} \left(\frac{M_{X_2}}{M_{X_1}} \right) \quad t_z = 2 \text{Log} \left(\frac{M_{X_2}}{m_{susy}} \right) \quad (\text{A2})$$

and $\tilde{\alpha}_i(t) = z_i(t) \tilde{\alpha}_i(0)$ and $\tilde{\alpha}_i(0)$ is the value at M_{X_2} . Without loss of generality we can assume $m_{susy} < M_{X_1} < M_{X_2}$.

The solutions to the one loop renormalization group evolution equations (RGE) for the gauginos can be solved exactly and are given as

$$\tilde{M}_i(m_{susy}) = M_i z_i(t_z) + M'_i z'_i(t_z) \quad (\text{A3})$$

where $M_a(M'_a)$ are the boundary values for the gauginos at scale $M_{X_2}(M_{X_1})$. In our notation quantities with $\sim$ represent the expressions at the m_{susy} scale due two sectors of SUSY breaking.

Similarly the A terms also add up linearly and are given as ⁸

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{A} &= A(t_z) + A'(t_z) \\ A(t_z) &= 0.33A_0 - 0.03M_1 - 0.26M_2 - 1.8M_3 \\ A'(t_z) &= -0.002\Lambda \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A4})$$

where A_0 is the boundary value for the trilinear coupling due to gravity mediation.

⁸ The semi-analytic expressions are for $M_{X_1} = 10^6$ and $M_{X_2} = M_{Pl}$

Next we consider the lighter generations. In the limit the Yukawa coupling $Y_{b,\tau} \rightarrow 0$, the solutions to the RGE equations for the first two generation squarks and the sleptons take a very simple analytic form. The solutions for the squarks and $\tilde{m}_{H_d}^2$ except $\tilde{m}_{Q_3,U_3,H_u}^2$ is given as

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{m}_{Q_{1,2}}^2 &= m_Q^2(t_z) + m_{Q_{1,2}}^{\prime 2}(t_z) + \frac{32}{3}M'_3M_3z_3(t_g)k'_3(t_z) + 6M'_2M_2z_2(t_g)k'_2(t_z) + \frac{2}{15}M'_1M_1z_1(t_g)k'_1(t_z) \\
\tilde{m}_{U_{1,2}}^2 &= m_{U_{1,2}}^2(t_z) + m_{U_{1,2}}^{\prime 2}(t_z) + \frac{32}{3}M'_3M_3z_3(t_g)k'_3(t_z) + \frac{32}{15}M'_1M_1z_1(t_g)k'_1(t_z) \\
\tilde{m}_{D_{1,2,3}}^2 &= m_{D_{1,2,3}}^2(t_z) + m_{D_{1,2,3}}^{\prime 2}(t_g) + \frac{32}{3}M'_3M_3z_3(t_g)k'_3(t) + \frac{8}{15}M'_1M_1z_1(t_g)k'_1(t) \\
\tilde{m}_{H_d}^2 &= m_{H_d}^2(t_z) + m_{H_d}^{\prime 2}(t_z) + 6M'_2M_2z_2(t_g)k'_3(t_z) + \frac{6}{5}M'_1M_1z_1(t_g)k'_1(t_z)
\end{aligned} \tag{A5}$$

The corresponding equations for the sleptons can be similarly written as

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{m}_L^2 &= m_L^2(t_z) + m_L^{\prime 2}(t_z) + 6M'_2M_2z_2(t_g)k'_2(t_z) + \frac{6}{5}M'_1M_1z_1(t_g)k'_1(t_z) \\
\tilde{m}_E^2 &= m_E^2(t_z) + m_E^{\prime 2}(t_z) + \frac{24}{15}M'_1M_1z_1(t_g)k'_1(t_z)
\end{aligned} \tag{A6}$$

1. Semi-analytic expression for m_{Q_3,U_3,H_u}^2

The expressions for m_{Q_3,U_3,H_u}^2 are more complicated as it involves the top quark Yukawa coupling which cannot be set equal to zero. However they follow the generic form of Eq.(8). We present semi-analytic expressions for them as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{m}_{Q_3}^2 &= m_{Q_3}^2(t_z) + m_{Q_3}^{\prime 2}(t_z) + 0.0001A_0\Lambda + 0.0054M_3\Lambda \\
\tilde{m}_{U_3}^2 &= m_{U_3}^2(t_z) + m_{U_3}^{\prime 2}(t_z) + 0.0004A_0\Lambda + 0.0045M_3\Lambda \\
\tilde{m}_{H_u}^2 &= m_{H_u}^2(t_z) + m_{H_u}^{\prime 2}(t_z) + 0.0006A_0\Lambda - 0.0041M_3\Lambda
\end{aligned} \tag{A7}$$

where $\Lambda = \frac{\langle F_1 \rangle}{M_{X_1}}$. In the above expression we have neglected the terms proportional to M_1 and M_2 as their co-efficients are small compared to that of M_3 . The semi-analytic expressions for the soft

terms at m_{susy} scale due to pure gravity mediation is given as

$$\begin{aligned}
m_{Q_3}^2 &= -0.0369233A_0^2 + 0.00443031A_0M_1 + 0.00154387M_1^2 + 0.0266445A_0M_2 - 0.00205633M_1M_2 \\
&\quad + 0.233435M_2^2 + 0.1096A_0M_3 - 0.00916469M_1M_3 - 0.0610636M_2M_3 + 3.31617M_3^2 \\
&\quad + 0.3312m_{Q_3}^{(0)2} - 0.11145(m_{Hu}^{(0)2} - 5m_{Q_3}^{(0)2} + m_{U_3}^{(0)2}) \\
m_{U_3}^2 &= -0.0738465A_0^2 + 0.00886063A_0M_1 + 0.0287372M_1^2 + 0.0532891A_0M_2 - 0.00411266M_1M_2 \\
&\quad - 0.0134655M_2^2 + 0.2192A_0M_3 - 0.0183294M_1M_3 - 0.122127M_2M_3 + 3.16522M_3^2 \\
&\quad - 0.222901(m_{Hu}^{(0)2} + m_{Q_3}^{(0)2} - 2m_{U_3}^{(0)2}) + 0.3312m_{U_3}^{(0)2} \\
m_{Hu}^2 &= -0.11077A_0^2 + 0.0132909A_0M_1 + 0.0156242M_1^2 + 0.0799336A_0M_2 - 0.00616898M_1M_2 \\
&\quad + 0.21997M_2^2 + 0.3288A_0M_3 - 0.0274941M_1M_3 - 0.183191M_2M_3 - 0.452999M_3^2 \\
&\quad + 0.3312m_{Hu}^{(0)2} - 0.334351(-m_{Hu}^{(0)2} + m_{Q_3}^{(0)2} + m_{U_3}^{(0)2}) \tag{A8}
\end{aligned}$$

where $m_{Q_3, U_3, Hu}^{(0)}$ represents the boundary value of the soft masses due to gravity mediation. The corresponding expressions due to gauge mediation with messenger scale at $M_{X_1} = 10^6$ is given as

$$\begin{aligned}
m_{Q_3}^{\prime 2} &\approx 1 \times 10^{-4} \Lambda^2 \\
m_{U_3}^{\prime 2} &\approx 7.62 \times 10^{-5} \Lambda^2 \\
m_{Hu}^{\prime 2} &\approx -4.65 \times 10^{-5} \Lambda^2 \tag{A9}
\end{aligned}$$

-
- [1] S. Chatrchyan *et al.*, “Observation of a new boson at a mass of 125 GeV with the CMS experiment at the LHC,” *Phys.Lett.*, vol. B716, pp. 30–61, 2012.
 - [2] G. Aad *et al.*, “Observation of a new particle in the search for the Standard Model Higgs boson with the ATLAS detector at the LHC,” *Phys.Lett.*, vol. B716, pp. 1–29, 2012.
 - [3] “Combination of standard model Higgs boson searches and measurements of the properties of the new boson with a mass near 125 GeV,” 2013.
 - [4] “Combined coupling measurements of the Higgs-like boson with the ATLAS detector using up to 25 fb⁻¹ of proton-proton collision data,” 2013.
 - [5] J. R. Ellis, G. Ridolfi, and F. Zwirner, “Radiative corrections to the masses of supersymmetric Higgs bosons,” *Phys.Lett.*, vol. B257, pp. 83–91, 1991.
 - [6] H. E. Haber and R. Hempfling, “Can the mass of the lightest Higgs boson of the minimal supersymmetric model be larger than $m(Z)$?,” *Phys.Rev.Lett.*, vol. 66, pp. 1815–1818, 1991.

- [7] Y. Okada, M. Yamaguchi, and T. Yanagida, “Upper bound of the lightest Higgs boson mass in the minimal supersymmetric standard model,” *Prog.Theor.Phys.*, vol. 85, pp. 1–6, 1991.
- [8] H. E. Haber, R. Hempfling, and A. H. Hoang, “Approximating the radiatively corrected Higgs mass in the minimal supersymmetric model,” *Z.Phys.*, vol. C75, pp. 539–554, 1997.
- [9] T. Hahn, S. Heinemeyer, W. Hollik, H. Rzehak, and G. Weiglein, “High-precision predictions for the light CP-even Higgs Boson Mass of the MSSM,” *Phys.Rev.Lett.*, vol. 112, p. 141801, 2014.
- [10] O. Buchmueller, M. Dolan, J. Ellis, T. Hahn, S. Heinemeyer, *et al.*, “Implications of Improved Higgs Mass Calculations for Supersymmetric Models,” *Eur.Phys.J.*, vol. C74, p. 2809, 2014.
- [11] J. Casas, J. Espinosa, M. Quiros, and A. Riotto, “The Lightest Higgs boson mass in the minimal supersymmetric standard model,” *Nucl.Phys.*, vol. B436, pp. 3–29, 1995.
- [12] M. S. Carena, J. Espinosa, M. Quiros, and C. Wagner, “Analytical expressions for radiatively corrected Higgs masses and couplings in the MSSM,” *Phys.Lett.*, vol. B355, pp. 209–221, 1995.
- [13] A. Arbey, M. Battaglia, A. Djouadi, F. Mahmoudi, and J. Quevillon, “Implications of a 125 GeV Higgs for supersymmetric models,” *Phys.Lett.*, vol. B708, pp. 162–169, 2012.
- [14] A. Arbey, M. Battaglia, A. Djouadi, and F. Mahmoudi, “The Higgs sector of the phenomenological MSSM in the light of the Higgs boson discovery,” *JHEP*, vol. 1209, p. 107, 2012.
- [15] P. Draper, P. Meade, M. Reece, and D. Shih, “Implications of a 125 GeV Higgs for the MSSM and Low-Scale SUSY Breaking,” *Phys.Rev.*, vol. D85, p. 095007, 2012.
- [16] M. J. Perez, P. Ramond, and J. Zhang, “Mixing supersymmetry and family symmetry breakings,” *Phys.Rev.*, vol. D87, no. 3, p. 035021, 2013.
- [17] M. Endo, K. Hamaguchi, S. Iwamoto, and N. Yokozaki, “Vacuum Stability Bound on Extended GMSB Models,” *JHEP*, vol. 1206, p. 060, 2012.
- [18] S. P. Martin and J. D. Wells, “Implications of gauge-mediated supersymmetry breaking with vector-like quarks and a 125 GeV Higgs boson,” *Phys.Rev.*, vol. D86, p. 035017, 2012.
- [19] T. Jelinski, J. Pawelczyk, and K. Turzynski, “On Low-Energy Predictions of Unification Models Inspired by F-theory,” *Phys.Lett.*, vol. B711, pp. 307–312, 2012.
- [20] T. T. Yanagida, N. Yokozaki, and K. Yonekura, “Higgs Boson Mass in Low Scale Gauge Mediation Models,” *JHEP*, vol. 1210, p. 017, 2012.
- [21] M. Abdullah, I. Galon, Y. Shadmi, and Y. Shirman, “Flavored Gauge Mediation, A Heavy Higgs, and Supersymmetric Alignment,” *JHEP*, vol. 1306, p. 057, 2013.
- [22] J. L. Evans, M. Ibe, S. Shirai, and T. T. Yanagida, “A 125GeV Higgs Boson and Muon $g-2$ in More Generic Gauge Mediation,” *Phys.Rev.*, vol. D85, p. 095004, 2012.
- [23] A. Albaid and K. Babu, “Higgs boson of mass 125 GeV in GMSB models with messenger-matter mixing,” *Phys.Rev.*, vol. D88, p. 055007, 2013.
- [24] M. Frank, L. Selbuz, L. Solmaz, and I. Turan, “Higgs Bosons in supersymmetric $U(1)'$ models with CP Violation,” *Phys.Rev.*, vol. D87, p. 075007, 2013.
- [25] J. A. Evans and D. Shih, “Surveying Extended GMSB Models with $m_h=125$ GeV,” *JHEP*, vol. 1308,

- p. 093, 2013.
- [26] N. Craig, S. Knapen, and D. Shih, “General Messenger Higgs Mediation,” *JHEP*, vol. 1308, p. 118, 2013.
 - [27] L. Calibbi, P. Paradisi, and R. Ziegler, “Gauge Mediation beyond Minimal Flavor Violation,” *JHEP*, vol. 1306, p. 052, 2013.
 - [28] P. Byakti and T. S. Ray, “Burgeoning the Higgs mass to 125 GeV through messenger-matter interactions in GMSB models,” *JHEP*, vol. 1305, p. 055, 2013.
 - [29] J. L. Evans, M. Ibe, and T. T. Yanagida, “Relatively Heavy Higgs Boson in More Generic Gauge Mediation,” *Phys.Lett.*, vol. B705, pp. 342–348, 2011.
 - [30] N. Craig, S. Knapen, D. Shih, and Y. Zhao, “A Complete Model of Low-Scale Gauge Mediation,” *JHEP*, vol. 1303, p. 154, 2013.
 - [31] W. Fischler and W. Tangarife, “Vector-like Fields, Messenger Mixing and the Higgs mass in Gauge Mediation,” *JHEP*, vol. 05, p. 151, 2014.
 - [32] M. E. Krauss, W. Porod, and F. Staub, “SO(10) inspired gauge-mediated supersymmetry breaking,” *Phys.Rev.*, vol. D88, no. 1, p. 015014, 2013.
 - [33] Z. Chacko and E. Ponton, “Yukawa deflected gauge mediation,” *Phys.Rev.*, vol. D66, p. 095004, 2002.
 - [34] Z. Chacko, E. Katz, and E. Perazzi, “Yukawa deflected gauge mediation in four dimensions,” *Phys.Rev.*, vol. D66, p. 095012, 2002.
 - [35] Y. Shadmi and P. Z. Szabo, “Flavored Gauge-Mediation,” *JHEP*, vol. 1206, p. 124, 2012.
 - [36] “David Shih, Talk at SUSY-2013, ICTP, Trieste, http://susy2013.ictp.it/lecturenotes/01_Monday/Shih.pdf,”
 - [37] R. Ding, T. Li, F. Staub, and B. Zhu, “Focus Point Supersymmetry in Extended Gauge Mediation,” *JHEP*, vol. 1403, p. 130, 2014.
 - [38] V. S. Mummidi and S. K. Vempati, “A little more Gauge Mediation and the light Higgs mass,” *Nucl.Phys.*, vol. B881, pp. 181–205, 2014.
 - [39] H.-S. Lee, K. T. Matchev, and T. T. Wang, “A U(1) -prime solution to the μ^- problem and the proton decay problem in supersymmetry without R-parity,” *Phys.Rev.*, vol. D77, p. 015016, 2008.
 - [40] V. Barger, P. Langacker, and G. Shaughnessy, “Singlet extensions of the MSSM,” *AIP Conf.Proc.*, vol. 903, pp. 32–39, 2007.
 - [41] J. F. Gunion, “Higgs bosons in the NMSSM and its U(1) extensions,” *AIP Conf.Proc.*, vol. 1078, pp. 42–48, 2009.
 - [42] D. A. Demir, G. L. Kane, and T. T. Wang, “The Minimal U(1)’ extension of the MSSM,” *Phys.Rev.*, vol. D72, p. 015012, 2005.
 - [43] E. Ma, “New U(1) gauge extension of the supersymmetric standard model,” *Phys.Rev.Lett.*, vol. 89, p. 041801, 2002.
 - [44] T. Han, P. Langacker, and B. McElrath, “The Higgs sector in a U(1)-prime extension of the MSSM,” *Phys.Rev.*, vol. D70, p. 115006, 2004.
 - [45] T. Cohen and A. Pierce, “Testing a U(1) Solution to the μ Problem,” *Phys.Rev.*, vol. D78, p. 055012,

- 2008.
- [46] P. Anastasopoulos, F. Fucito, A. Lionetto, G. Pradisi, A. Racioppi, *et al.*, “Minimal Anomalous U(1)-prime Extension of the MSSM,” *Phys.Rev.*, vol. D78, p. 085014, 2008.
 - [47] A. Brignole, L. E. Ibanez, and C. Munoz, “Soft supersymmetry breaking terms from supergravity and superstring models,” *Adv. Ser. Direct. High Energy Phys.*, vol. 21, pp. 244–268, 2010.
 - [48] K. A. Intriligator, N. Seiberg, and D. Shih, “Supersymmetry breaking, R-symmetry breaking and metastable vacua,” *JHEP*, vol. 0707, p. 017, 2007.
 - [49] K. A. Intriligator and N. Seiberg, “Lectures on Supersymmetry Breaking,” *Class.Quant.Grav.*, vol. 24, pp. S741–S772, 2007.
 - [50] S. A. Abel, J. Jaeckel, V. V. Khoze, and A. Ringwald, “Illuminating the Hidden Sector of String Theory by Shining Light through a Magnetic Field,” *Phys.Lett.*, vol. B666, pp. 66–70, 2008.
 - [51] M. K. Gaillard, “Symmetry and Superstring Phenomenology,” *Contemp.Math.*, vol. 490, pp. 229–240, 2009.
 - [52] M. A. Buican, *Supersymmetry Breaking and Its Mediation in String Theory and Particle Physics*. PhD thesis, Princeton U., 2009. <https://inspirehep.net/record/1256527/files/M.Buicanthesis.pdf>.
 - [53] V. Braun, Y.-H. He, and B. A. Ovrut, “Supersymmetric Hidden Sectors for Heterotic Standard Models,” *JHEP*, vol. 1309, p. 008, 2013.
 - [54] M. Cvetič, J. Halverson, and H. Piragua, “Stringy Hidden Valleys,” *JHEP*, vol. 1302, p. 005, 2013.
 - [55] M. Goodsell and A. Ringwald, “Light Hidden-Sector U(1)s in String Compactifications,” *Fortsch.Phys.*, vol. 58, pp. 716–720, 2010.
 - [56] S. de Alwis, “Mediation of Supersymmetry Breaking in a Class of String Theory Models,” *JHEP*, vol. 0903, p. 023, 2009.
 - [57] L. L. Everett, I.-W. Kim, P. Ouyang, and K. M. Zurek, “Deflected Mirage Mediation: A Framework for Generalized Supersymmetry Breaking,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 101, p. 101803, 2008.
 - [58] K. Choi, A. Falkowski, H. P. Nilles, M. Olechowski, and S. Pokorski, “Stability of flux compactifications and the pattern of supersymmetry breaking,” *JHEP*, vol. 0411, p. 076, 2004.
 - [59] K. Choi, A. Falkowski, H. P. Nilles, and M. Olechowski, “Soft supersymmetry breaking in KKLT flux compactification,” *Nucl.Phys.*, vol. B718, pp. 113–133, 2005.
 - [60] O. Loaiza-Brito, J. Martin, H. P. Nilles, and M. Ratz, “ $\text{Log}(M(\text{Pl}) / m(3/2))$,” *AIP Conf.Proc.*, vol. 805, pp. 198–204, 2006.
 - [61] O. Lebedev, H. P. Nilles, and M. Ratz, “A Note on fine-tuning in mirage mediation,” pp. 211–221, 2005.
 - [62] A. Pierce and J. Thaler, “Prospects for Mirage Mediation,” *JHEP*, vol. 0609, p. 017, 2006.
 - [63] H. Abe, T. Higaki, T. Kobayashi, and Y. Omura, “Moduli stabilization, F-term uplifting and soft supersymmetry breaking terms,” *Phys.Rev.*, vol. D75, p. 025019, 2007.
 - [64] K. Choi, K. S. Jeong, T. Kobayashi, and K.-i. Okumura, “TeV Scale Mirage Mediation and Natural Little SUSY Hierarchy,” *Phys.Rev.*, vol. D75, p. 095012, 2007.

- [65] M. McCullough, “Stimulated Supersymmetry Breaking,” *Phys.Rev.*, vol. D82, p. 115016, 2010.
- [66] N. Craig, J. March-Russell, and M. McCullough, “The Goldstini Variations,” *JHEP*, vol. 1010, p. 095, 2010.
- [67] G. Ferretti, A. Mariotti, K. Mawatari, and C. Petersson, “Multiphoton signatures of goldstini at the LHC,” *JHEP*, vol. 1404, p. 126, 2014.
- [68] R. Argurio, K. De Causmaecker, G. Ferretti, A. Mariotti, K. Mawatari, *et al.*, “Collider signatures of goldstini in gauge mediation,” *JHEP*, vol. 1206, p. 096, 2012.
- [69] C. Cheung, F. D’Eramo, and J. Thaler, “The Spectrum of Goldstini and Modulini,” *JHEP*, vol. 1108, p. 115, 2011.
- [70] C. Cheung, Y. Nomura, and J. Thaler, “Goldstini,” *JHEP*, vol. 1003, p. 073, 2010.
- [71] E. Dudas, Y. Mambrini, S. Pokorski, A. Romagnoni, and M. Trapletti, “Gauge versus Gravity mediation in models with anomalous $U(1)$ ’s,” *JHEP*, vol. 0903, p. 011, 2009.
- [72] G. Hiller, Y. Hochberg, and Y. Nir, “Flavor Changing Processes in Supersymmetric Models with Hybrid Gauge- and Gravity-Mediation,” *JHEP*, vol. 0903, p. 115, 2009.
- [73] M. Dine and W. Fischler, “A Phenomenological Model of Particle Physics Based on Supersymmetry,” *Phys.Lett.*, vol. B110, p. 227, 1982.
- [74] C. R. Nappi and B. A. Ovrut, “Supersymmetric Extension of the $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ Model,” *Phys.Lett.*, vol. B113, p. 175, 1982.
- [75] L. Alvarez-Gaume, M. Claudson, and M. B. Wise, “Low-Energy Supersymmetry,” *Nucl.Phys.*, vol. B207, p. 96, 1982.
- [76] G. Giudice and R. Rattazzi, “Theories with gauge mediated supersymmetry breaking,” *Phys.Rept.*, vol. 322, pp. 419–499, 1999.
- [77] E. Dudas, S. Lavignac, and J. Parmentier, “A Light neutralino in hybrid models of supersymmetry breaking,” *Nucl.Phys.*, vol. B808, pp. 237–259, 2009.
- [78] P. Binetruy and E. Dudas, “Gaugino condensation and the anomalous $U(1)$,” *Phys.Lett.*, vol. B389, pp. 503–509, 1996.
- [79] E. Dudas, S. Pokorski, and C. A. Savoy, “Soft scalar masses in supergravity with horizontal $U(1)$ -x gauge symmetry,” *Phys.Lett.*, vol. B369, pp. 255–261, 1996.
- [80] Y. Nomura, M. Papucci, and D. Stolarski, “Flavorful supersymmetry,” *Phys.Rev.*, vol. D77, p. 075006, 2008.
- [81] L. Randall and R. Sundrum, “A Large mass hierarchy from a small extra dimension,” *Phys.Rev.Lett.*, vol. 83, pp. 3370–3373, 1999.
- [82] D. Marti and A. Pomarol, “Supersymmetric theories with compact extra dimensions in $N=1$ superfields,” *Phys.Rev.*, vol. D64, p. 105025, 2001.
- [83] K.-w. Choi, D. Y. Kim, I.-W. Kim, and T. Kobayashi, “Supersymmetry breaking in warped geometry,” *Eur.Phys.J.*, vol. C35, pp. 267–275, 2004.
- [84] K.-w. Choi, D. Y. Kim, I.-W. Kim, and T. Kobayashi, “SUSY flavor problem and warped geometry,”

2003.

- [85] E. Dudas, G. von Gersdorff, J. Parmentier, and S. Pokorski, “Flavour in supersymmetry: Horizontal symmetries or wave function renormalisation,” *JHEP*, vol. 1012, p. 015, 2010.
- [86] F. Brummer, S. Fichet, and S. Kraml, “The Supersymmetric flavour problem in 5D GUTs and its consequences for LHC phenomenology,” *JHEP*, vol. 1112, p. 061, 2011.
- [87] A. M. Iyer and S. K. Vempati, “Warped Alternatives to Froggatt-Nielsen Models,” *Phys.Rev.*, vol. D88, no. 1, p. 016005, 2013.
- [88] D. Chowdhury, R. Garani, and S. K. Vempati, “SUSEFLAV: Program for supersymmetric mass spectra with seesaw mechanism and rare lepton flavor violating decays,” *Comput.Phys.Commun.*, vol. 184, pp. 899–918, 2013. 1109.3551.
- [89] C. Froggatt and H. B. Nielsen, “Hierarchy of Quark Masses, Cabibbo Angles and CP Violation,” *Nucl.Phys.*, vol. B147, p. 277, 1979.
- [90] M. B. Green and J. H. Schwarz, “Anomaly Cancellation in Supersymmetric D=10 Gauge Theory and Superstring Theory,” *Phys.Lett.*, vol. B149, pp. 117–122, 1984.